DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 387 853 EA 026 943

AUTHOR Patrick, James Edward
TITLE Correlation between Administrative Style and School Climate.
PUB DATE [95]
NOTE 20p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Effectiveness; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Styles; *Organizational Climate; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The principal's administrative style strongly influences teachers' satisfaction. This paper provides an overview of literature on administrative styles and presents findings of a study that explored the relationship between principals' leadership styles and school climate. A principal-evaluation survey was distributed to 30 graduate students in the Curriculum and Instruction Department at Chicago State University. Findings showed a statistically significant correlation between respondents' scores on school climate and those of principals' administrative style, gender of the principal, respondents' teaching experience, and respondents' job position. The most significant correlation was between perceptions of school climate and gender of the principal. The data show an overall correlation between administrative style and school climate. One table is included. A copy of the questionnaire and statistical data are included. (Contains 20 references.) (LMI)

CORRELATION BETWEEN ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE AND SCHOOL CLIMATE

JAMES EDWARD PATRICK

CORRELATION BETWEEN ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE AND SCHOOL CLIMATE

JAMES EDWARD PATRICK

The school administrator works with a variety of people, including students, teachers, and parents. Although no single individual or group should be considered by the administrator to be more important than another there is little doubt that their relationship with the staff will significantly influence their effectiveness as a leader. While a positive relationship won't guarantee effective administrative leadership, it is difficult to conceive how an administrator could continue to function successfully as a leader if their relationship with the staff were a negative one.

Although there is no clear-cut evidence which indicates clearly that a teacher's satisfaction with their job and their effectiveness of performance are related, it seems logical that a direct relationship exists. The evidence indicates that, where teachers have freedom to plan their work and opportunities to participate in policy-making in matters of curriculum and teacher welfare, morale is high. Equally important is consistency of administrative behavior, so that teachers know what to expect. The relationships which teachers have with their peers in informal groups in the school are also very important. Perhaps the most important ingredient in teacher satisfaction is the attitude of the teacher toward the principal.

During the past six decades there has been a concerted attempt to study and determine what makes a good administrative style. More recently schools of education have carried on studies of Leadership in Education both independently and as a result of the stimulus provided by the Cooperative Study of Educational Administration. The studies which Lewin and his collaborators carried out indicate that in our culture, which emphasizes democratic action, the democratic type of leadership was more effective than the authoritarian. They also indicate that abdication of responsibility, or Laissez-faire leadership, results in anarchy of chaos. As a matter of fact, someone in every group will provide leadership, even though it may be of a very low level and no sense of professional.

Baehr and Renck concluded that the attitude of the teacher toward the principal is critically important. Chase reported on nearly 1800 teachers in 43 states. Three-fourths of the teachers regarded freedom to plan their work as most important. Good salaries and proper equipment were ranked second and stimulating professional leadership was ranked third. Other studies from the

Midwest Administration Center at the University of Chicago have pointed up the need for consistency in administrative behavior. Bidwell concluded that teacher satisfaction is largely related to what teachers expect of their administrator and their perception of their behavior.

The factors which affect teacher satisfaction are the attitude which the principal shows toward teachers, the satisfaction which teachers enjoy in informal peer groups, the amount of freedom which teachers enjoy in planning their work, an opportunity to participate in planning policies which affect them and the attitude of the principal. If the principal is to be successful, they must be consistent. It is better if they are a democratic leader. But even an autocratic principal or laissez-faire principal if they are consistent, can be understood and perhaps be respected although not well liked. There is no clear-cut experimental evidence to indicate that happy teachers are effective, but it is a logical assumption. It is unlikely that a highly discontented group of teachers would provide an ideal school climate.

The effectiveness of a principal is at least partly a function of the school climate in which they work. School climate refers to the way teachers of the school fit together, with the school's goals. An important task of the principal is to work for a climate in which curriculum development, instruction, and student learning can continue to improve. When teachers have assurance of their own worth and of their jobs's importance, a sense of belonging to the group, and a trust in the official leadership, they are ready to attempt to improve instruction. The organization of a school for efficient management is determined by the conception of management of the school principal.

The oldest conception of management found in local school is distinctly autocratic. The principal is limited in their power only by state law, board of education rules, and administrative regulations. Since the state has generally left the management and control of local schools very largely to the discretion of boards of education, and the boards in turn have delegated the control chiefly to their administrative officers, a large concentration of power has inevitably become vested in those who are charged with managerial duties.

The head of the school also assumed responsibilities over teachers and classroom procedures, except those which were prescribed by board rule or the superintendent's instructions. The exercise of these managerial powers followed the pattern established by the earlier teachers, namely autocratic rule.

The effects of such management on pupils and teachers are complete subservience to orders, unnatural and artificial bearths and demeanor, and the tendency to disregard orders when not under direct supervision. Such control is effective only under the watchful supervision of the school head. In the absence of the head, no one is disposed to assume responsibility for which authority has not been conferred; the authority exercised by the head then goes into default.

The opposite of authoritarian control is found in schools in which the principals' practices of administration approximate laissez-faire. These principals, in seeking to avoid the display of authority, frequently neglect to assume their proper responsibility. In schools so administered responsibility for control is greatly diffused. Some individuals assume much authority without officially recognized responsibility while others who are charged with responsibility fail to exercise their rightful authority. Laissez-faire administration is usually characterized by lack of organization. The activities of the school are carried on largely without plan or direction from the executive head. They justify their practices on the ground of their disbelief in authoritarian control.

In democratic administrations, all the personnel of the schools must be fairly represented in policy-making and appraisal. People are assigned to tasks in which their special aptitudes may be utilized most effectively and that the facilities should be arranged to serve best the needs of the entire community. There is representation from parents, teachers, and students in an elected local school council. In cases which involve policy concerning the welfare of the staff representation of teachers, selected by teachers who are privileged to speak freely without fear of administrative displeasure or reprisal is required. This does not mean administration by committees, and the policy is carried out through the regular administrative channels. The widest possible participation in management on the part of all the members of the school community should be encouraged by the principal. Opportunities should be provided for participation in planning as well as in execution. The responsibility for making policy carries with it the duty of supporting the policy when it has been decided on by the group and of personally doing all one can to make it effective.

Most educational administrators have ben trained to view and implement leadership from two perspectives. The first is an authoritarian perspective in which the administrator is regarded as a managerial link in a closely defined chain of command. The second and more widely prescribed perspective is a democratic one which stresses participative decision making. The authoritarian model is the leadership analogue to bureaucratic organizations. It is based upon clearly defined lines of authority

responsibility and communication. Because it accounts for specialization of functions, roles, and regularity , it is predictable, accountable, and in some respects efficient. Schools are bureaucratic organizations in some but not all respects. Because of this and because the authoritarian model prevails in the broader society, it has strongly influenced the leadership behavior of school administrators.

Whereas the authoritarian model emphasizes decisiveness by administrators and deference by subordinates, the democratic model stresses participative decision making, informality, and colleagueship. The authoritarian model emphasizes single-minded devotion. To task completion; advocates of democratic leadership, even that concern for task completion must be tempered by consideration for the feelings of those to be affected by decisions. It is argued that democratic leadership is particularly appropriate for schools because teachers are professionals whose expertise should be acknowledged in decision making. Advocates of student and community involvement argue that they too should be involved in making decisions that affect them.

Lewin and Lippitt (1939) and White and Lippitt (1960) did some of the earlier studies to investigate the effects of democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire patterns's of leadership on group climate and group achievement. A large number of studies followed these early studies on autocratic and democratic patterns of leadership. The results are mixed. Stogdil concluded that the evidence does not show that democratic leadership increases production. However, the evidence is strong that democratic leadership is positively related to group member satisfaction. Some investigators compared group-members-centered and task-centered leadership. Out of 28 studies reported by Stogdill (1974), nineteen showed a positive relationship between follower-oriented leaders and production, and nine studies showed either a zero or negative relationship. The evidence was even stronger in favor of follow-oriented leaders and the satisfaction of their followers. But there was still a large number of cases at variance with the follower-oriented theory of leadership. The evidence is beginning to form that there may not be one best style of leadership behavior.

Stogdill's (1974) review of the literature on participative and directive leadership found that the number of studies that showed a positive correlation between directive leadership and production was about equal to the number of studies that showed a positive correlation between participative leadership and production. Group member satisfaction and group cohesion were found to be associated with participative leadership in significantly more studies, but even here there were some studies that indicated zero and negative correlations. Stogdill (1974) reviewed the research on consideration and initiation of

structure and group performance. The results were mixed. About half of the studies showed a positive correlation between group productivity and consideration. The relationship between group productivity and structure was positive in thirteen studies and zero in five studies. Group satisfaction and group cohesiveness were positively related to both consideration and structure in most of the studies, but there were still some studies that did not show a positive relationship. Stogdill (1970) observed that several studies indicate that consideration and structure interact to influence productivity and satisfaction. The most effective leaders tend to be described as high on both scales.

Results from the styles of leadership approach to the study of leadership have been rewarding. The evidence is strong that the behavior of the leader is an important factor in group effectiveness. But research also show that it is only one factor among many. Fleishman, Harris, and Burtt (1955) found that freshly trained supervisors had a tendency to revert back to leadership behavior that was more consistent with the expectations of the situation. Results from the traits and styles of leadership approaches have led to a different approach to the study of leadership. Marks, Ghilford, and Merrifield (1959) concluded, they view leadership from a behavioral and situational point of view. That leadership is a function of the situation and its requirements, and of the followers and their expectations as well as of qualities of the leader.

One of the most famous experiments was conducted with a group of 10-year-old boys at the University of Iowa in the late 1930's. Four adult leaders were trained to proficiency in each of the three different leadership styles, authoritarian, democratic, and Laissez-faire. The basic findings were that if efficiency is evaluated in terms of both work production and social satisfaction, democracy was clearly superior to both autocracy and laissez-faire, the boys were less efficient than when they were under democratic supervision, and they also did not like the club activities as much. The boys did work as efficiently under authoritarian as they did under democratic supervision, but they enjoyed themselves more under democracy.

Most administrator recognize the importance of developing and maintaining high staff satisfaction and morale. High staff satisfaction and morale may be desirable as ends in themselves, but their primary value is in helping to achieve other kinds of worthwhile goals. These goals would include staff stability, cohesiveness, and increased effectiveness. Although research on the consequences of high or low staff satisfaction and morale is not conclusive, it would appear that the extent of staff satisfaction and morale can influence the degree to which the goals previously mentioned can be achieved. For these reasons then, the administrator needs to understand better the factors which contribute to low or high staff satisfaction and morale and

based on that understanding they should develop conditions which will build and maintain the latter.

Sergiovanni conducted a study of 3,382 teachers and discovered that achievement, recognition, and responsibility contributed predominantly to staff satisfaction. Advancement was not a factor which was associated with satisfaction of teachers, or, for that matter, with dissatisfaction. The work itself was a potential source of either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. As revealed in Sergiovanni's investigation, those factors which seemed to contribute primarily to teacher dissatisfaction were poor relations with peers and students, unfair or incompetent administrative and supervisory policies and practices and outside personal problems. It should be noted that the conditions affecting satisfaction or dissatisfaction or both as reflected in Sergiovanni's study, did not vary with the sex, teaching level, or tenure status of the teacher.

It would appear then, that by and large the same factors do not hold equal potential for creating staff satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The conditions which create staff satisfaction seem to be associated with the work itself, while the conditions which contribute to dissatisfaction seem to be associated with the environment of work, particularly the interpersonal relations aspect of that environment. These findings are consistent with Maslow's theory that individuals have a hierarchy of needs and that lower level needs such as security must be met before the higher level needs such as achievement or responsibility become important.[15]

In a study involving 5,000 teachers in twenty-four school systems Redefer discovered that the two factors most significantly related to the morale of the faculty were the evaluation given by the administrator to the teachers and the quality of education in the individual schools. A major implication of his findings is that if an administrator wants to build and maintain good faculty morale, one of the more important things they can do is to attempt to develop the best possible educational program. If teachers feel that they are associated with a good education program, the possibly some of the other factors which may contribute to low or high morale will not seem so important.

Lambert studied the relationship between faculty morale and school principals' leadership behavior in twenty-one schools. The research instruments used to collect data from the teachers were Halpin's Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and the Purdue Teacher Opionnaire. An analysis of the data showed that high leader behavior scores were associated with high morale scores and that the consideration component of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was more closely correlated with teacher morale than was the initiating component. The

consideration factor reflects the extent of mutual trust, respect, and warmth between a leader and the group with whom they are working; the initiating factor is concerned with a leader's establishing for a group the necessary procedures, channels of communication and ways of getting a job done. Lambert found, in addition, that when the teachers in the study perceived their morale as low, they also perceived the total educational environment as low. Also a study on teacher morale was done by Napier and he identified twelve factors which were associated with high teacher morale. The results of Napier's research again underscore the importance of the administrator's exhibiting educational leadership, consideration for others, and the development of a good educational program, as essential conditions for building and maintaining high staff morale.

A critical review of twenty-five years of research on morale concluded that whether or not teachers were satisfied depended primarily on the quality of the administrative relationships in which teachers were involved and the quality of the leadership they received. A study of education in an urban setting found that significant improvement in reading skills was related to high teacher morale which was associated with principal leadership behavior. Therefore a major key to high faculty morale and satisfaction seems to be the leadership behavior of the school administrator.

One widely-noted theory suggests that each administrator has a basic leadership style that governs his or her behavior. Fiedler developed a contingency theory of leadership effectiveness that uses an easily administered questionnaire to distinguish among administrators according to how they regard their "least-preferred coworker" (LPC). People who describe their LPC negatively tend to be more autocratic and task-oriented and less democratic and relationship-oriented than people with high LPC scores. Fiedler's theory is that people with high or low LPC scores have different leadership styles and that the effectiveness of these styles varies according to situational factors.

Another recent approach to leadership theory is that of Vroom and Yetton, who developed a model to guide decision making. Their taxonomy of decision-making modes ranges from unilateral decision-making through consulting with others to achieve consensus, to delegating the problem and responsibility for its solution to others. In choosing one of these modes, the authors say that the leader should be guided by the particular characteristics of the problem or situation. Another recent theory with somewhat broader application is the path-goal theory of leadership developed by Evans and House. The basic assumption of path-goal theory is that leader behavior has its most direct effect on the psychological states of subordinates. A major proposition of the theory is that the function of a

leader is to work with subordinates in ways that lead to motivation to perform or satisfaction with the job. A second proposition is that the particular leader behaviors that will achieve this motivating function are determined by situational factors.

The most pervasive implication of the theories discussed here for school administrators is that there is no single best way for leaders to behave. Administrators need to be aware of their own tendencies in leadership situations and to understand the range of behaviors open to them. Moreover, they must combine this self-assessment with a perceptiveness about the characteristics of subordinates and environmental factors.

The traditional view of leadership holds that the leader exercises influence over followers. Hollander refers to leadership as a transitional process, and asserts that for leaders to maintain influence over a group, they must allow the group to exercise some influence over them. Followers assess the effectiveness of leaders based on their responsiveness to the followers' needs. Thus leaders should be mindful of the views and preferences of followers as they communicate with them, for their effectiveness in exercising influence will depend upon their status and legitimacy with the group. Administrators who wish to retain legitimacy with such groups allow themselves to be influenced in matters where the group's expertise is greater Indeed their ultimate influence may be strengthened if they not only allow but encourage the group to provide its own leadership is such matters.

Leadership is a process through which an individual secures the cooperation of others toward the achievement of goals in a particular setting. Early theory and research pertaining to leadership focused upon one-best-way theories. More recently, contingency theories have been advanced by Fiedler, Vroom, Yetton, and House. These theories suggest directions for leader behavior in school settings based upon the leader's assessment of the settings. In drawing on these theories, school administrators are advised to persist toward clear attainable goals, use multiple path and information networks, acknowledge the importance of counter influence, and consider the public interest. School administrators are also advised that whether or not teachers were satisfied depended primarily on the quality of the administrative relationships in which teachers were involved and the quality of the leadership they received. That high faculty morale and satisfaction seems to be the leadership behavior of the school administrator which influence positive school climate.

Therefore there is a need for additional research on the relationship between administraive style and school climate. Hence, the null hypothesis is there will not be a significant correlation between administrative style and school climate.

Procedures

Population

The population in this study will include graduate students from the Curriculum and Instruction Department, in the College of Education. The graduate students come primarily from the City of Chicago, its suburbs, and from 15 states and 18 foreign countries. The graduate students are commuter students which includes a high percentage of females; and students are older than those of traditional college age.

Sample

Thirty Chicago State University graduate students will be chosen at random from the school's Curriculum and Instruction Department.

Method of Data Collection

The Teacher's Principal Evaluation Survey was distributed to Chicago State University graduate students for completing and returning to me after completion.

Instrument

The Teacher' Principal Evaluation survey is used to measure teachers' attitudes toward the effectiveness of the principal.

There was a total of thirty statements. The first category contained fourteen statements, the second category contained six statements, the third category contained five statements, and the fourth category contained five statements. Teachers were also asked to select one of four administrative styles to describe their principal.

The findings will be tabulated in terms of means and standard deviations. the Pearson Product-Moment Coefficient Test will be employed at the .05 level of confidence to determine the statistical significance of the findings. Cross tabs will be employed to determine the influence of administrative style and gender, and teachers position and experience.

Results

Using the Pearson Product-Moment Coefficient, a test was done on the results of administrative styles and gender and teacher's position and experience to determine if there was a statistically significant correlation. Table I summarizes the statistical analysis.

Correlation between administrative styles and school climate, gender, employee's experience and position of the sample.

Table I

	Mean	S.D.	Correlation With Climate
Administrative Style	2.8	1.11	.58
School Climate	2.33	.83	
Gender	1.63	.49	.83
Experience	3.17	.97	.70
Position	2	1.12	.69

N = 30

According to the Table of r's -

At .05 (Confidence Level), r - .36

Table I indicates that there is a statistically significant correlation between scores on the school climate and those of administrative style, gender, employees experience and position.

It should be noted that the most significant correlation was found between scores on school climate and gender of the principal. There was also a significant correlation between employee's experience and position and school climate. There was also a significant correlation between administrative style and school climate which lends credence to the theory expressed in the review of literature, that administrators style impact the school climate.

Overall, the data leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis and the acceptance of the research hypothesis; there is a correlation between administration style and school climate. I recommend that additional research be done in this area because it is important how teachers feel about their principals and schools, and how well they do their jobs. School administrators should take a long-range view of leadership. They should understand that school situations are complex, dynamic, and interactive. They should take a broad view of organizational relations instead of a narrow insider's view. Also, there is no one best way for leaders to behave. But how they behave has a direct impact on the school climate and a well run school.

TABLE II - RESULTS

TEACHERS' PRINCIPAL EVALUATION SURVEY

Your Position

1. Teacher [14] 47%
2. Counselor [5] 17%
3. Assistant Principal [4] 13%
4. Coordinator [7] 23%

Level

1. Elementary [13] 43%
2. Secondary [13] 43%
3. Preschool [1] 3%
4. Other [3] 10%

Location/School

1. Public Chicago [26] 87%
2. Public Suburb [2] 7%
3. Non-Public Chicago [1] 3%
4. Non-Public Suburb [1] 3%

Experience

1. 1 - 5 Years [2] 7%
2. 6 - 10 Years [6] 20%
3. 11 - 15 Years [7] 23%
4. 16 or Higher Years [15] 50%

Gender of Principal

1. Male [11] 37%
2. Female [19] 63%

Directions. To the right of each item, please Circle the number which in your opinion best describes your principal performance:

3	Very good. Exceeds the requirements of the position
2	Satisfactory. Meets the requirements of the position
1	Poor. Performs below the requirement of the position.
0	Don't know. Not enough information or does not apply.

This survey is CONFIDENTIAL.

N = 30

	Very Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Don't Know
1. My principal backs me in situations where students misbehave and let's me know what action was taken	3 (14) 47%	2 (10) 33%	1 (5) 17%	0 (1) 3%
2. I am able to talk to my principal freely and openly.	3 (15) 50%	2 (11) 37%	1 (4) 13%	0
3. My principal is consistent and practices what he/she preaches.	3 (8) 27%	2 (15) 50%	1 (7) 23%	0

4. My principal makes me feel that the work I do is important and that my contribution is worth while.	3 (16) 53%	2 (9) 30%	1 (4) 13%	0 (1) 3%
5. If my principal delegates a responsibility to me, I know he/she will let me handle the job and that they will back me.	3 (17) 57%	2 (11) 37%	1 (2) 7%	0
6. My principal is receptive to constructive criticism.	3 (8) 27%	2 (9) 30%	1 (11) 37%	0 (2) 7%
7. My principal will and can make a decision. When I go to him/her, I get an answer.	3 (10) 33%	2 (16) 53%	1 (4) 13%	0
8. My principal is available or accessible, whenever I need to see him/her.	3 (11) 37%	2 (14) 47%	1 (5) 17%	0
9. The evaluation of teachers by my principal is fair.	3 (9) 30%	2 (10) 33%	1 (8) 27%	0 (3) 10%
10. I get adequate encouragement and praise from my principal.	3 (9) 30%	2 (17) 57%	1 (4) 13%	0
11. All departments or areas of interest receive equal treatment by my principal.	3 (5) 17%	2 (14) 47%	1 (8) 27%	0 (3) 10%
12. My principal represents our building staff fairly and adequately with the central administration staff.	3 (12) 40%	2 (16) 53%	1 (2) 7%	0
13. My principal is fair in assigning duties to staff members.	3 (7) 23%	2 (12) 40%	1 (8) 27%	0 (3) 10%
14. My principal respects me as a human being.	3 (17) 57%	2 (12) 40%	1 (1) 3%	0

15. My principal plans and conduct faculty meetings that are worthwhile.	3 (12) 40%	2 (16) 53%	1 (2) 7%	0
16. My principal plans and conduct faculty meetings that are well organized.	3 (15) 50%	2 (12) 40%	1 (3) 10%	0
17. My principal plans and conduct faculty meetings that are interesting.	3 (12) 40%	2 (15) 50%	1 (3) 10%	0
18. My principal plans, organizes, and communicates regarding schedule adjustments and building organization.	3 (7) 23%	2 (18) 60%	1 (5) 17%	0
19. My principal demonstrates the ability to provide items necessary in conducting my class, i.e., materials and supplies.	3 (14) 47%	2 (12) 40%	1 (4) 13%	0
20. Building policies and regulations are written and clearly understood.	3 (10) 33%	2 (14) 47%	1 (6) 20%	0
21. My principal provides adequate leadership to our staff in developing and understanding our philosophy and objectives.	3 (9) 30%	2 (15) 50%	1 (5) 17%	0 (1) 3%
22. My principal can build an adequate schedule which accommodates all curriculum areas and student needs	3 (11) 37%	2 (14) 47%	1 (4) 13%	0 (1) 3%
23. My principal encourages staff to improve curriculum content.	3 (12) 40%	2 (17) 57%	1 (1) 3%	0
24. My principal fosters and support change.	3 (13) 43%	2 (11) 37%	1 (5) 17%	0 (1) 3%
25. My principal supports innovation at the building and system levels.	3 (16) 53%	2 (10) 33%	1 (3) 10%	0 (1) 3%

26. My principal knows and functions effectively within the power structure of our school district.	3 (15) 50%	2 (13) 43%	1 (2) 7%	0
27. My principal knows and functions effectively within the power structure of our community.	3 (13) 43%	2 (14) 47%	1 (3) 10%	0
28. My principal communicates well with parents as individuals or groups.	3 (9) 30%	2 (16) 53%	1 (5) 17%	0
29. My principal knows when and how to involve parents in the life of the school.	3 (9) 30%	2 (15) 50%	1 (6) 20%	0
30. My principal understands and has empathy with the social-economic ethnic character of this community.	3 (12) 40%	2 (12) 40%	1 (5) 17%	0 (1) 3%

Your principal's administrative style could be described as being one of the following:

1. **Laissez- faire (Anarchic-No Leadership)** - 5 = 17%
2. **Democratic (Self-Governing-Open)** - 7 = 23%
3. **Autocratic (Dictatorial - Domineering)** - 7 = 23%
4. **Transactional (Adjusts Style to Circumstances)** - 11 = 37%

Thank you for your cooperation.

Footnote Entries

[1]J.A. Culbertson, P.B. Jacobson, and T. Keller, Administrative Relationships, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960, Chapter 6, "Maintaining Morale," pp. 414-437.

[2]T.J. Sergiovanni and F.D. Carver, The New School Executive, New York: Dodd, Mead, 1974.

[3]K. Lewin, and R. Lippitt, 1939. "An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary note," Sociometry, 1: 292-300.

[4]R. White, and R. Lippitt, 1960. "Leader behavior and member reaction in three social climates' Group Dynamics, eds. D. Cartwright and A. Zander. Evanston, IL: Row Peterson.

[5]R.M. Stogdill, 1974. Handbook of Leadership. New York: Free Press, p. 370.

[6]Ibid., p. 380.

[7]Ibid., p. 390.

[8]Ibid., pp. 393-397.

[9]Ibid., p. 396.

[10]E.A. Fleishman, E.F. Harris, and H.E. Burtt, 1955. Leadership and Supervision in Industry. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research.

[11]A. Marks, J.P. Guilford, and P.R. Merrifield, 1959. "A study of Militancy Leadership in relation to selected intellectual factors," Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior, eds. L. Petrullo and B.M. Bass. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

[12]R. White and R. Lippitt, "Leader Behavior and Member Reaction in Three Social Climates," Group Dynamics, eds. D. Cartwright and A. Zander. Evanston, IL: Row Peterson, pp. 527-553.

[13]T. Sergiovanni, "Factors which affect satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of teachers," Journal of Educational Administration 5, May 1967: 66-82.

[14]J.M. Maas, "A study of the relationship between specified characteristics of teachers and their perceptions of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction factors," Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1968.

[15]A. Maslow, Motivation and Personality, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1954.

[16]F.L. Redefer, "Factors that affect teacher morale," Nation's School's 63, February 1959: 59-62.

[17]M.P. Murphy, "An investigation of the relationship between teacher more and organizational climate in selected high schools," Ed.D. diss., University of Massachusetts, 1974.

[18]T.G. Napier, "Teacher Morale," Ed.D., University of Nebraska, 1966.

[19]C.E. Blocker and R.C. Richardson, "Twenty-five years of morale research, A critical review," Journal of Educational Sociology 36, January 1963: 200-210.

[20]First National City Bank, Public Education in New York City, New York: First National City Bank, 1969.

[21]F. Fiedler, A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

[22]V.H. Vroom and P.W. Yetton, Leadership and Decision-Making, Pittsburgh, PA. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973.

[23]M.G. Evans, "The Effects of Supervisory Behavior on the Path-Goal Relationship," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 56, 1970: 277-298.

[24]R.J. House and G. Dessler; "The Path-Goal Theory of Leadership: Some Post Hoc and A Priori Tests," Hunt an Larson, eds., Contingency Approaches to Leadership, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Pres 1974.

[25]E.P. Hollander, Leadership Dynamics: A Practical Guide to Effective Relationships, New York: MacMillan, 1978.

Bibliography

Blocker, C.E. and Richardson, R.C., "Twenty-five years of Morale Research, A Critical Review, Journal of Educational Sociology 36, January 1963, 200-210.

Culbertson, J.A., Jacobson, P.B., and Keller, Administrative Relationships, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960, Chapter 6, "Maintaining Morale," pp. 414-437.

Evans, M.G., "The Effects of Supervisory Behavior on the Path-Goal Relationship," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 56, 1970, pp. 277-298.

Fiedler, F., A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness, New York:: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

First National City Bank, Public Education in New York City, New York: First National City Bank, 1969.

Fleishman, E.A., Harris, E.F., and Burtt, H.E., 1955. Leadership and Supervision in Industry, Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research.

Hollander, E.P., Leadership Dynamics: A Practical Guide to Effective Relationships, New York: MacMillan, 1978.

House, R.J., and Dessler, G., "The Path-Goal Theory of Leadership: Some Post Hoc and a Priori Tests," in Hunt and Larson, eds., Contingency Approaches to Leadership, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1974.

Lewin, K., and Lippitt, R., 1939, "An Experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary note," Sociometry, 1: pp 292-300.

Maas, J.M., "A study of the relationship between specified characteristics of teachers and their perceptions of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction factors," Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1968.

Marks, A., Guilford, J.P., and Merrifield, P.R., 1959, "A study of Militancy Leadership in relation to selected intellectual factors" Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior, Eds. Petrallo and Bass, New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Maslow, A., Motivation and Personality, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1954.

Murphy, M.P., "An investigation of the relationship between teacher morale and organizational climate in selected high schools," Ed.D. diss., University of Massachusetts, 1974.

Napier, T.G., "Teacher Morale," Ed.D., University of Nebraska, 1966.

Redefer, F.L., "Factors that affect teacher morale," Nation's Schools 63, February 1959: pp. 59-62.

Sergiovanni, T., "Factors which affect satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of teacher," Journal of Educational Administration 5, May 1967: pp. 66-82.

Sergiovanni, T., and Carver, F.D., The New School Executive, New York: Dodd, Mead, 1974.

Stogdill, R.M., 1974. Handbook of Leadership. New York: Free press, p. 370.

White, R., and Lippitt, R, 1960. "Leader behavior and member reaction in three social climates," Group Dynamics, eds. Cartwright and Zender. Evanston, IL.: Row Peterson.

Vroom, V.H., and Yetton, P.W., Leadership and Decision-Making, Pittsburgh, PA University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973.